



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MEDIEVAL ENGLISH APPRENTICESHIP AS BUSINESS EDUCATION

LEVERETT S. LYON

School of Commerce and Administration, University of Chicago

If the vital relations of any business were charted, its internal and external activities might be represented as two circles impinging upon one another, with the management on the alert at the point of contact. The internal problems would arise out of the interrelations of the activities of production and distribution and of what we have been calling administration, for lack of a better name. The external problems would have to do, first, with the special public the business is concerned with, its customers, its direct and potential competitors, and the general body of labor from which it draws its workers, executives, salesmen, clerks, and factory operatives. And outside this circle, another, much larger, might be traced to indicate the relations of the business with the individuals making up the special public of the business and the members of its organization. For the attitude even of employees is affected by their social judgment of the business, its methods, and its aims.¹

The point of view expressed in this quotation, when applied to an ancient business curriculum, that of medieval apprenticeship, throws an interesting light on that system of business education. We have done medieval apprenticeship an injustice in conceiving it to be primarily a training in technical skill. Medieval apprenticeship attempted technical training in craft skill, but it also attempted much more. It was the institution relied upon to give candidates for membership in the guilds the ability to conduct a business in a difficult economic and social environment. It was even more. It was the institution relied upon to effect a complete social adjustment for the youths who were to become influential in town life. The support for so sweeping a statement lies largely in observing evidence upon three matters: (1) the relation of an apprentice to the craft guilds, (2) the nature of the master-craftsman's business and social problems, and (3) the direct evidence of apprenticeship as managerial, moral, and social education.

¹ A. W. Shaw, *An Approach to Business Problems* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1916), p. 321.

APPRENTICESHIP AS THE INSTRUMENT OF THE CRAFT GUILDS

Although it did not always remain so, apprenticeship was in its development the instrument of the guilds. This statement is important in view of the fact that apprenticeship later became a matter of statute and is now, in our country, an affair of state legislation. But it is most important to notice this statement because of the implication that since apprenticeship was a guild tool it could be used to conduce to whatever would aid the guilds.

That apprenticeship was a guild institution is shown repeatedly in the ordinances and documents of the old companies. Thus we find the Dyers of Bristol insisting on apprenticeship in that "forasmuch as often before these times divers folk, as well as those who have not been apprentices, servants, or masters of the said mistery, as other folk who are of other misteries, not cunning nor having knowledge in the aforesaid art of dyeing, have taken upon them to dye cloths and wools put in woad as well of good folk of the town as of the country round, which, by reason of illmanagement and lack of knowledge of the said folk, are greatly impaired of their colors."¹

The White Tawyers of London declared "that none who has not been an apprentice and has not finished his time of apprenticeship in the said trade shall be made free of the said trade, unless it be attested by the overseers or by four persons of the said trade that such person is able and sufficiently skilled to be made free of the same."² The ordinances of the Braelers leveled a rule at him that would be a journeyman without good training, legislating "if there be any journeyman in such calling who does not know his trade, let him be ousted therefrom if he will not be apprenticed to learn his said trade."³

That apprenticeship was strictly a guild institution and that it was adapted to various needs is further apparent from the difference in the terms of indenture. Thus the Fullers of Northampton

¹ A. E. Bland, P. A. Brown, and R. H. Tawney, *English Economic History; Select Documents* (London: G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1914), pp. 141-42.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 136-38.

³ Henry Thomas Riley, *Memorials of London and London Life in the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Centuries* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1868), I, 278.

required only four years' apprenticeship, the Weavers six years, while the Lorimers of London held ten years to be the necessary period of training. The Ordinances of the Plumbers of London set forth very clearly the way in which this system of education was molded by the guilds to their own purpose.

In the first place, that no one of the trade of Plumbers shall meddle with works touching said trade within the said city, or take house or apprentices, or other workmen in the same, if he be not made free of the city; and that, by the assent of the best and most skilled men in the said trade, testifying that he knows how well and lawfully to work, and to do his work; and so the said trade may not be scandalized, or the commonalty damaged and deceived, by folks who do not know their trade.

Also—that no one of the said trade shall take an apprentice for less than seven years; and that he shall have him enrolled within the first year, and at the end of his term shall make him take up his freedom, according to the usage of the said city.¹

In 1563, in the great Statute of Apprentices the central government sought definitely to standardize apprenticeship education for guild membership. This act may well be viewed as a stamp of official approval on the efforts of the guilds and an attempt of the state to assure itself of the benefits of guild training. "The most interesting portion of the great statute connected with the craft-gild system is perhaps that which defines the period of apprenticeship, the first general definition of the kind by national legislation. Some recognition of the value of the institution of the apprenticeship in industrial life apparently induced the government to put it on a national basis and to incorporate a clause regarding it in the Statute of Laborers."²

Thus national legislation touching apprenticeship was unknown during the period when the institution was developing and while it was most important. Apprenticeship was the instrument of the guilds, devised by them, and developed by them as a means properly to train novices in the skill, duties, and responsibilities of membership in the brotherhood of the craft. It was the accepted route to a skilled trade; but it was vastly more; it was a carefully arranged initiation into full and intimate participation in the guild

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 321-22.

² Stella Kramer, *English Craft Guilds and the Government* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1905), p. 3.

life. Its educational significance can, then, be indicated only by some examination of the meaning of guild life. Let us first view the guildsman—the master-craftsman—in some of his more strictly business relationships.

THE GUILDSMAN AS A BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

The coming of modern business may have brought us large-scale production, machine technique, and the wide market, but it certainly did not introduce a complicated problem for the director of a business. Complexity was already old. The master-guildsman was confronted, if we follow the classification of Mr. Shaw, with a large number of internal problems.¹ He had need to be versatile, indeed, to administer them successfully. Within his shop and store he dealt with his customers if they bought wares or if they brought materials upon which he was to work, as was frequently the case with the bakers. If men sold him raw materials from which he was to fashion articles for trade, as might be the case if he were one of the tapicers who were required by their ordinances to buy “good wool of England or Spain,” he might likewise meet them in his own shop.

The master-craftsman was the chief factor in the technical work in his shop. He not only directed the work of his employees, the journeymen, and guided the efforts of the apprentice, but he performed a large part of the work himself. As master, he organized the work of the others and administered questions of wages, discipline, and hours and conditions of work. Even where the broad policies in these matters were laid down by the brotherhood, their administration was in his hands.²

To the degree necessary the guildsman was a capitalist. He furnished the shop and the implements of production. An inventory of the instruments of a brewer of London in 1335 showed the following: “two leaden vessels, one old chest, and one *masshfat* (mash-vat), value 18d; one *rarynfat* (fining-vat), value 6d; one *heyr* (highstand) for tuns, value 12d; three sets of handmills,

¹ A. W. Shaw, *op. cit.*, chap. i.

² “It was no uncommon thing for the wardens to distrain his workshop and his working tools for non-payment of wages or the king’s ferme” (Joshua Toulmin Smith, *English Gilds* [London: N. Trubner & Co., 1870], IV, cxvii).

value 4s; one piece of lead, value 2d; one tun, and one half-tun, value 8d; one *yelfat* (ale-vat), value 18d; 5 *kemelynes* (tubs for brewing), value 10d; one *clensingbecche* (Qy. as to this), value 4d; also, one *alegiste* ("gist," or stand for small casks), value 2d."¹

The master-craftsman was a teacher, charged with the tremendously important duty of teaching others to perform the many duties which he himself faced. He was bound under the clauses of indentures to instruct his apprentices well and fully in all the arts of his trade and he was subject to penalties if he should fail in his duties as an educator. He agreed that he would keep his apprentice "as an apprentice should be, that is to say meat and drink, hose and shoes, linen, woolen, and his craft to be taught him and nothing hid from him thereof." An old indenture reads, "John Gibbs and Agnes, his wife" bind themselves that they "shall teach, train, and inform or cause the aforesaid John Goffe, their apprentice, to be informed in the craft of fishing in the best way they know how."²

In the ways cited, at least, then, the master-craftsman, as a business manager, faced administrative problems of no mean sort. In all of those activities which Shaw lists as location, construction, and equipment of plant, and the material agencies and organization used in operation, the master was an administrator.

THE EXTERNAL PROBLEMS OF THE CRAFTSMAN MANAGER

The "internal problems" of business administration could not be allowed to occupy the entire attention of the guildsman. Even more numerous and perplexing were a set of matters which may be regarded as "external problems."

The craftsman manager directed his business unit in a social environment, and although there was more of propinquity than in the modern situation there was no less of complexity. An analysis of this social environment indicates that there were some three spheres that need consideration. One was the market, the "trade" of the craftsman. The proper treatment of the problems in this field must have taxed then, as it does now, the best thought of the

¹ Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

² A. E. Bland, P. A. Brown, and R. H. Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

"manager." Second was the guild itself. This brotherhood of business men of a common calling, organized as it was for mutual aid and protection and for eliminating the wastes of competition, brought with it all the responsibilities and problems of associated action. Finally, the guildsman was a citizen and a public officer. Membership in the guild was frequently coincident with citizenship and the guilds were semi-public bodies. They were the recognized devices used by municipality, or central government, or both, for the regulation and control of industry, for "the guild under the master and wardens became a better unit for civic administration than the ward under the alderman."¹

The guild's position in the last respect was complicated by the fact that it existed by virtue of the authority of municipality or crown. The former was by far the more common authority in England and we can be reasonably confident that in reading the ordinances of a guild we are reading legislation that was not out of harmony with the borough's attitude on those matters. The intimate relation between the guild and the town makes it difficult to tell how far the craft exercised powers independent of the borough. Yet there is significance in the fact that rarely do we discover anywhere a set of craft by-laws, or even a few isolated regulations, which do not show signs of municipal indorsement or oversight. When craft guilds needed confirmation of their trade regulations they asked the borough and the community for it. In the leet rolls of the time is strong evidence that guild ordinances out of harmony with governmental authority were amercable. Thus, it was decreed to fine the tanners, "and because they have a gild hurtful to the lord King in buying hides, and because they correct transgressions which ought to be pleaded before the bailiffs (one mark)." Similarly of the cobblers, "because they have a gild contrary to the prohibition of the lord King." Also of the saddlers "because they have a gild hurtful to the lord King (one mark); of the fullers for the same (half a mark)."² The

¹ Charles M. Clode, *The Early History of the Guild of Merchant Taylors of the Fraternity of St. John the Baptist, London, with Notices of the Lives of Some of Its Eminent Members* (London: Harrison & Sons, 1875), I, 55.

² Norwich, England, Courts-leet. *Leet Jurisdiction in the City of Norwich during the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (London: B. Quaritch, 1892), pp. 39, 42-43.

dyers of Coventry also "made an unlawful ordinance" with the result that it was ordained by the leet "that the said unlawful and hurtful ordinances made by the said dyers be utterly void, quashed, and annulled."¹

In considering the perplexities of the guildsman in all this, it is well to keep in mind that the demands of the social environment of the business were then, as now, tangled and interlaced. "In actual practice, state, borough, and gild presented frequently the appearance of a three-fold combination of almost equal forces working together for a common end. It is therefore not always easy to consider the gilds apart as distinct organs with their own special purposes and functions." Especially is this obvious when we note that guildsmen themselves were often magistrates, as in 1241 when a member of the mercers' guild became mayor of London and later members of the vintners' company frequently held that office. In the same way in Durham "the twenty-four," two of whom were elected from each of the twelve "misteries" of the town, constituted, with twelve aldermen, the common council; and in York the common council consisted of members chosen from the crafts.²

The not easy task, then, of the master-craftsman in dealing with external relations of his business was to harmonize the social demands of the guild, the city, and perhaps the state with the acquisitive possibilities of the market.

BUSINESS AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Specific illustrations of the clash of business interest with one or more of the agencies of control will show more clearly the difficult position of the master-craftsman and will serve to make more vivid the difficult situation for which the guilds used apprenticeship as a preparation.

One task of the guildsman as a business man was to secure demand for his goods. This led to display of wares and other simple forms of advertising. But here the craftsman met with

¹ Mary Dormer Harris, *Life in An Old English Town* (London: Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd.; New York: Macmillan Co., Ltd., 1898), p. 265.

² Stella Kramer, *op. cit.*, I, 3.

social regulations, and, it should be noted, social regulations for which he himself was in part responsible. The ordinances of the Spurriers of London ordered that "no one of the trade shall hang his spurs out on Sunday, or any other days that are double feasts; but only a sign indicating his business; and such spurs as they do sell they are to show and sell within their shops, without exposing them without or opening the doors or windows of their shops, on the pain aforesaid."¹

As to the quality of product that would be most profitably marketed there was again place for a clash between the individual guildsman and the agencies of control. The desire individually to profit by adulteration and the sale of inferior goods must have been strong, but social agencies controlled. For example, the ordinances of the Pelterers of London required that "no one of the trade shall mingle bellies of calabre with furs of puree, or of minever of bisshes."² And when one acted against these ordinances he forfeited his furs to the guild in which the default was found, and, in addition, was imprisoned and fined upon his release. The Waxchandlers of London forbade, on pain of confiscation, imprisonment, and fine, the use of cobbler's wax, rosin, fat, "or other manner of refuse," or the use of old wax and worse within and new wax without.³ The Pepperers of Soperlane had a list of forbidden acts that reflects a recognition of more deceitful ingenuity, and so profit-seeking, than of pious honesty among that "worshipful brotherhood," and the White-tawyers demanded an amercement and a forfeit from all who falsely wrought skins.⁴ The Ordinances of the Pewterers of London laid down the combination of metals for rounded and squared articles, and forbade manufacture until the wardens had assayed the metal. The Glovers forbade themselves to sell "false work." The Pewterers left the punishment to the discretion of the wardens, but the Glovers ordered that such goods should be burned, which "was accordingly done, on Monday

¹ Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.*, pp. 321-22.

² *Ibid.*, p. 329. *Calabre*, a poor fur; *puree*, a superior fur; *bisshes*, some part of the skin of the hind.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 300.

⁴ A. E. Bland, P. A. Brown, and R. H. Tawney, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

next after the feast of St. Gregory the Pope, with some fifty-four false pouches" and seventeen pairs of gloves which were found upon various members of the guild at about that time. The Furbishers made regulations about the reforging of broken swords and prescribed the kind of leather that might be used in scabbards.¹

The question of working hours and the conditions of work were likewise matters on which the craftsman must have found himself of one opinion in his own shop and of another in the guild hall. The exercise of self-interest, however, brought him into conflict with social regulation. The Spurriers of London found that "many persons of the said trade had compassed how to practice deception by working by night rather than by day." "And then they introduce false iron, and iron that has been cracked, for tin, and also they put gild on false copper and cracked." Further than this, these night workers spent the day in wandering about and then "having become drunk and frantic, they take to their work." Annoyance to the sick, and broils with the neighbors were the inevitable results, as well as danger to the whole city, from the sparks "which so vigorously issue forth in all directions from the mouths of chimneys in their forges." The London Hatters forbade night work for the express purpose of allowing the wardens all opportunity to inspect the work of the craftsmen. The Glovers went a step farther than either of these, and put the ban not only on artificing at night, but on selling as well.²

Wages as well as hours and conditions of work were part of the guildsman's labor problem. It would be only less erroneous to assume that each individual craftsman and journeyman was habituated to and satisfied with prevailing rates than to assume that the modern manager is happily acquiescent with the minimum-wage and child-labor laws or that trade unions are always content with the findings of arbitration boards. The whole organization of apprenticeship was, of course, in one sense the setting up of machinery

¹ Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.*, "Ordinances of the Pewterers, Articles of the Glovers, and Ordinances of the Furbishers," pp. 232-50, 258. The furbishers had a special injunction forbidding a guildsman to take any manner of work from a lord or other great person "if he be not a man perfect by reason of the great perils which may befall the lords and among others the people."

² Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.*, "Ordinances of the Glovers," pp. 239, 246.

to administer certain labor matters, but we find that general questions of wages of journeymen or "any of our servants" to be paid in the guild were to be met¹—these, of course, more pressingly later on. Wage appeals were made² and in certain towns what we would think of as crude labor exchanges were established to provide for the best adjustment of the supply of labor to the demand.³

THE PROBLEM OF UNFAIR COMPETITION

We are sometimes inclined to assert that the craft guilds were monopolistic and thus lead ourselves to the thought that the craftsman escaped the problems of competition. A more careful analysis shows this to be an error. Among the merchant guilds the "common fund" of profits may have been sometimes known, but such an agreement was not consistent with craft-guild organization. The craft guilds were examples of association rather than amalgamation or merger. Each individual felt the pressure of his own pecuniary interests as well as the interests of the whole. In so far as comparisons are possible with modern monopolistic organizations the guilds are better compared to wholesalers' or retailers' trade associations than to the United States Steel Corporation or the Northern Securities Company. They were associations rather than combinations, and there must have been a constant pressure by the individual to override the ruling of the association just as in the early industrial pools the members were with difficulty kept in line.

All of the regulations regarding quality of work which were so carefully supervised by the wardens are indications that the market interests of one individual were at odds with those of another in the same craft. But more than this, some guilds made doubly sure that no individual should gain at the expense of his guild and escape through lack of identification. One investigator of trade-marks goes so far as to say: "As a rule, a master, on becoming

¹ *York Memorandum Book* (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1912), Vol. CXX of the Publications of the Surtees Society, p. 107.

² Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

³ See E. Lipson, *An Introduction to the Economic History of England* (London: A. and C. Black, Ltd., 1915), I, 309-10, for a more extended discussion.

such, was required to choose a mark. This mark he was obliged to use on all his goods, and to retain all his life. The marking of goods with this mark was neither optional, nor a mere right, but was an obligation to his gild; it was a part of his duty to the community demanded by the strict social order of the craft gilds of the Middle Ages."¹

So general a conclusion may somewhat overstate the case, but certain it is that many of the guilds recognized the competitive dangers of anonymous production even in the limited market of the time. The articles of the heaumers (helmet-makers) of London required that each should have his own mark. Loss of freedom was the penalty for violation. The blacksmiths of the same town required that all work not marked should be forfeited.² The bakers of Chester also were required to mark certain loaves and to register their marks.³ The spirit of competition, then, was pressing even if it was restrained by regulation.

But not only within the guild was there a tendency to compete. Ever urgent was the problem of competition between guilds. In recent months we have heard of the Wholesale Grocers' Association in vigorous complaint to the federal government against what they regarded as the unfair encroachments of the packers who, in the process of integrating allied industries, have been working into fields previously occupied by the complainants. Similar conflicts were frequently among the questions to which the craftsman manager found need to address himself. Thus in London in 1395, a dispute arose between the cobblers and the cordwainers, in which the cobblers alleged that they could no longer make a living as formerly, because of the encroachments of the cordwainers on their trade. The mayor commanded an inquisition by twenty-four men,

¹ Edward S. Rogers, "Historical Matter Concerning Trade Marks," *Michigan Law Review*, IX, 29-43. Mr. Rogers quotes most frequently from Kohler, "Das Recht des Markenschutzes," but referring to Statute 4 Edward IV C. P. I., Richard III C. 8 (11 Statutes of the Realm, pp. 404-6) points out that "these matters were regarded in much the same way in France, Italy, Germany, and England."

² Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.* ("Articles of the Heaumers and Articles of the Blacksmiths"), pp. 238, 539.

³ Rupert H. Morris, *Chester in the Plantagenet and Tudor Reigns* (Chester: Printed for the author, 1893), p. 415.

twelve of whom were to be "new workers called cordwainers of the said city, and twelve were old workers called cobblers." They were charged to present and declare that which was due and would belong in "right and reason to either side." To plead this important question must have involved no small knowledge of the history of the crafts, their customs and recognized rights, and the interests involved. It was settled to the satisfaction of all, it being agreed "that no person who meddles with old shoes, shall meddle with new shoes to sell; and that every manner of work which may be made of new leather belong to the new workers without their meddling with any old work to sell."¹

In adjusting his individual business, therefore, to its social environment the master-craftsman manager faced a number of problems of peculiar difficulty and complexity. Coloring all of them and confusing all of them was the fact that he must consider them from several points of view at the same time. Whether he considered his problem of wages, labor, hours and conditions of work, advertising, the quality of goods, or the proper nature of competition, his was not a single eye. He was at once employer, worker, legislator, public citizen, and, perhaps, municipal official. He made guild regulations to restrain what he himself wished to do. He was the object of his own legislation. In a position of such difficulty and complexity he held company with his fellow-guildsman and into that company he admitted new members. But he admitted them only by the road which he helped to build—the road of apprenticeship.

Such a view of the craftsman's problems indicates something of the real purpose of this institution. It brought the novice into real competition with his fellow-guildsmen but it brought him also into a real partnership. It qualified him not only to work but to vote on all the social questions that were of business importance. It was thus, in a way, not unlike the present ideal which we hold for education in a democracy—an instrument qualifying for equal participation in activities of social, business, and political life.

¹ Henry Thomas Riley, *op. cit.*, II, 540. A case similar to this which was not settled until it reached Parliament, is described by I. B. Heath in "Some Account of the Grocers Company," p. 122. Here the Druggists Company, claiming a monopoly of the trade, prayed protection against the invasion of the College of Physicians.

With a culmination to apprenticeship so significant to the guild it would be indeed strange if apprenticeship was, as the tool of the guild, not molded to bring satisfactorily trained members into the brotherhood. And, in such a training, right attitudes and accepted points of view would be as important results as technical skill. There was need that the guild bring the new members to the common mind quite as much as a primitive tribe, a modern nation, or a trade union finds a need for training novitiates to the general attitudes of the group.

MORE DIRECT EVIDENCE OF THE SOCIALIZING CHARACTER OF APPRENTICESHIP

There is a great deal of direct evidence indicating that apprenticeship was purposed to adjust the apprentice to his social environment. First of all it is worth while to wonder if a guild membership bought by many years of service would not go farther toward giving the new guildsman the desired point of view concerning the admission of new members than any amount of direct propaganda could have done. Moreover, this long training made the guildsman competent to teach technical work at least, which was necessary to continue the circle of guild life. That the pedagogical duties of the master were taken seriously by the guild becomes evident when it is noted that the guilds, at least in certain towns, did not allow everyone to assume the duties of instruction. Thus at Chester it was forbidden by the goldsmiths that the graduate apprentice should be allowed to take apprentices of his own, until he had served three years as a journeyman.¹

But there were in the organization of apprenticeship other elements which were definitely planned to guide the conduct of the apprentice, to regulate his morals, and to form his character in such a way that he would be fitted for his complicated task. The apprentice, apparently, was as strictly bound by regulations pertaining to his behavior as he was by those pertaining to his work.

¹ Rupert H. Morris, *Chester in the Plantagenet and Tudor Reigns* (Chester: Printed for the author, 1893), p. 443. Regulations having the same effect were in vogue at Leicester where the journeyman was required to work for wages for three years before setting up shop (*Records of Leicester*, III, 28). Similar rules prevailed for the carpenters and paviors of London.

If the guilds admitted undesirable characters to the brotherhood, it was not due to failure to attempt to exclude them. The apprentice was "bound" to behave. The master exercised a superintendence over his moral well-being, and this superintendence could be enforced with proper discipline. Even the apparel of the apprentice was regulated in a way purposed to be good for the cultivation of a spirit proper to his position. He was forbidden to gamble and even to enter gambling houses or other places of moral danger. The indenture binding Walter Byse, apprenticed to John Gare, says, "And the said Walter shall well and truly kepe his occupacyon, and do such things as the saide John shall bid him do, as unto the saide Walter shall be lawful and lefull, and the saide Walter shall be none ale goer neyther to no rebeld not sporte the said eight yeres without the license of the saide John." Roistering of any sort was frowned upon and "night roving" is a term in guild literature which always carries condemnation when applied to an apprentice. In some cases an examination or a proof of moral qualities was required of the apprentice before admission to the guild was permitted. The apprentice was frequently forbidden to marry until he had become one of the craft, or if allowed to marry the permission of the master was necessary.¹ Lacroix cites the following as rules laid down in an effort to inculcate morality and good feeling into the guild: (1) Youths were denied admission who could not prove legitimacy by baptismal register. (2) To obtain freedom the candidates must have irreproachable character. (3) Artisans exposed themselves to reprimand and chastisement for associating or working or drinking with those who had been expelled. (4) Licentiousness and misconduct rendered them liable to be deprived of membership.²

The master also who contracted to teach his trade to an apprentice was required by the guild regulations to pay strict attention to

¹ Instances of close supervision of conduct are shown in Joshua Toulmin Smith's "English Gilds, CXXIX," in *The Records of the City of Norwich* (Norwich: Jarrold & Sons, Ltd., 1906-10), II, 28; in Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 274; and in extracts from the *Records of the Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle-upon-Tyne* (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1895-99), Vol. XCIII of the Publications of the Surtees Society, II, 20.

² Paul Lacroix, *Manners, Customs, and Dress during the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance Period* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1874), p. 295.

his moral and social education. The Ordinances of the Cappers of Coventry are perhaps typical in their provision that the wardens might admonish a master of whose treatment an apprentice complained and could remove the apprentice for better instruction to a different master. They tested the efficiency of instruction by yearly examinations of apprentices.

Finally, there was, as the most important element in the social education of the apprentice, his close, personal, and continuous relation to the master-craftsman. From the standpoint of training in the management of business, both in internal and external relations, the effect of this was all-important. The apprentice was associated with the master every day in the shop. He met those who came to sell and those who came to buy. Every attack upon the problems of internal administration was under his observation, and no contact with the social environment was so far removed that he was unaware of it. Daily he must have heard the master discuss the social situation with fellow-craftsmen of the same interests, and doubtlessly the apprentice, as he grew in skill and the confidence of the master, must have entered into the discussion of business problems.

The relationship of master and apprentice outside of the shop was of such a character as to effect the most desirable education for the apprentice, both in business and in all those important social contacts which have been described. The master was bound to feed, clothe, and house the apprentice. The younger man ate at his master's table, slept under his roof, aided the wife and family of the guildsman in their home, and was in a very full sense "one of the family." Social differences were small, and the future of the apprentice of such certainty, if he took advantage of circumstances, as to give no reason for a feeling of caste.

With such features, it is evident that the institution of apprenticeship was well planned to train for business in that broad sense which involves an adaptation to the social environment by which a business is limited and conditioned quite as much as in the technical processes of craft skill.